DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 273 958 CS 209 960

AUTHOR Zale, Pamela K.
TITLE Ethical Goals in Freshman Composition: A Course for Humanists in Argumentation.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (37th, New Orleans, LA, March 13-15, 1986).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Guides - Classroom Use - Guides (For Teachers) (052)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Development; College Curriculum; College Freshmen; Course Content; Critical Reading; *Freshman Composition; Higher Education; Humanistic Education; Moral Issues; Moral Values; Peer Evaluation; *Persuasive Discourse; Rhetorical Criticism; Rhetorical Invention; Social Values; Student Attitudes; *Teaching Methods; Values Education; *Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS Toulmin (Stephen)

ABSTRACT

A course at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis offers students the opportunity to learn argumentative writing, while becoming aware of scholarly discourse in the arts, humanities, and sciences. Students realize that what once passed for a simple argument in everyday life becomes more sophisticated as they learn about research methodology, tests of evidence, modes and forms of logical reasoning, and problem-solving strategies. Persuasive writing assignments are given within a social setting, specifically, classroom discussion, written peer response and evaluation, and teacher-student interchange. Because students must present their arguments to their peers, they are more committed to their position, and take care in presenting and maintaining their argument. The sheer multiplicity of legitimate opinion and point of view which arises within a single classroom fosters an awareness necessary for moral and ethical growth. In this class, many students progress from a fairly narrow view of life to a more tolerant one simply because of their exposure to different value systems. For example, one student began the course totally dependent on the value systems of her family and peer community. After refutation by another student and instruction in logical argumentation, this student wrote a paper supporting her original position, but in a reasoned, logical manner using Toulmin's methods of argumentation. This course in argument, centered on issues, offers a means for students to work toward a sense of commitment. (SRT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED273958

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Ethical Goals in Freshman Composition: A Course for Humanists in Argumentation

Pamela K. Zale

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Pamela K. Zale

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS209960

Ethical Goals in Freshman Composition: A Course for Humanists in Argumentation

By Pamela K. Zale

Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis

My presentation, "Ethical Goals in Freshman Composition: A Course for Humanists in Argumentation," justifies teaching a semester of argumentative writing, provides an overview of our course at Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis, sets realistic expectations for students who are just beginning to write persuasive discourse, and uses the ethical progress of one particular student to illustrate how developmental theorists and researchers like Piaget, Britton, Perry, Kohlberg, and Bereiter can help us set realistic ethical and pedagogical writing goals for our students.

Our course, W132, offers the opportunity for beginning students to be introduced to the world of scholarly discourse in the arts, humanities, and sciences. Students are exposed to the ongoing interchange among professionals who develop, support, and defend their research, opinions, and conclusions. What once passed for a simple argument in everyday life becomes more sophisticated for students as rational, logical discussion of issues. Further, students become familiar with research methodology, tests of evidence, modes and forms of logical reasoning and problem solving strategies useful not only in the attainment of an academic degree but in everyday life.

In both 1964 and 1980 the Report of the Commission on the Humanities reported that the humanities are undervalued in schools, higher education, and private life. James Kinneavy explains that the alienation of rhetoric from the humanities has had a direct effect on this decline (Kinneavy 20). What Kinneavy finds most lacking since rhetoric dropped from the English Curriculum is the sense of committment required by rhetoric (23). Our course offers a series of persuasive assignments that

move students toward a growth of committment.

To encourage students toward committment, our course includes a collaborative component. Just as students learn to write by writing in a social setting, so too do they learn persuasion and idea from a social setting. The goals of collaboration in an argumentative writing class are sharply focused on the range of thought on a particular issue, but it remains writing within a community. Classroom discussion, written peer response and peer evaluation, and teacher-student interchange are as much a part of the setting as lecture materials. Our students are being asked, often for the first time, to create and defend their own positions. Inasmuch as they offer their arguments to their classmates, as well as to their instructors, they may begin to master the skills of maintaining those arguments. The sheer multiplicity of legitimate opinion and point of view which may arise within a single classroom of Arts and Science students is instructive in fostering an awareness necessary for moral and ethical growth.

In fostering such growth, the relevance of the cognitive developmental models becomes evident with the first assignment. To aid in the transition from their first semester freshman course, one which moves students from expressive to transactional writing to a second semester of argumentative writing, W132 instructors begin with the "analysis" assignment. In this task, students must select an article from a scholarly journal and write an analysis. The assignment requires several skills crucial to the argumentative discourse required later in the course: critical reading, summary, paraphrase, interpretation, and analysis. Primarily an expository presentation of an argumentative piece, the analysis provides students an exposure to persuasive discourse. As they move to this new universe of discourse, one that involves not only a shift in approach but a shift from safe, expository topics to a world of

issues which will require ethical judgments, students often regress in writing proficiency. This occasional regression is particularly noticeable in their difficulty in moving from summary to interpretation and analysis. According to Piaget, the shift from concrete operational thinking to formal operational thinking occurs at age 12. Then why do many of our older students become stuck in the concrete realm of summary? Their lack of progress in moving to the abstract, categorical nature of interpretation and analysis in ethical argument suggests that when they enter a new task environment, students may regress to concrete, situational thinking and writing. Agreed, our students are not age 11, and using a childhood developmental model can be criticized. Annette Bradford, however, explains freshman writers' inability to move to abstract thinking with the notion that Piaget's stages fit the average student. "Although age 11 may mark the beginning of Formal Operations, this period may extend into adulthood before the ability to abstract concepts is fully developed" (19). James Britton concurs with the observation that students have only begun to deal adequately with persuasive and speculative discourse at the age of eighteen ("Rhetorical Maturity" 119).

Carl Berieter's stages of writing offer information to help understand the regressive writing of freshman students entering the world of ethical discourse. His stages are associative writing (a combination of controlled association of ideas with written language production on a fundamental level); performative writing (which adds to the associational writing an awareness of style and mechanics); communicative writing (which adds audience awareness); and unified writing (which adds critical judgment.) Unified writing "takes into account not only other people's perspectives but also the writer's own perspective as a reader. The last stage, epistemic writing, "emerges" when the person's skill system for

reflective thought is integrated with his skill system for unified writing (73-93).

Berieter's stages depend on how automatic the material is. Certain information is stored in long-term memory, and this information does not need conscious attention in short term memory that slows down the writing process (Root 79). Therefore, writers have a great deal more to think about when they enter new writing constraints. As the task becomes more automatic so will the writing improve. Since writers who have achieved unified or epistemic writing in one area may find themselves at the performative or associative stages when shifting to new forms of expression, it is understandable that our students sometimes do not write as well as they have in the previous course.

Susan Miller ("Rhetorical Maturity" 124) finds similar writing regression in hers and others' students as they enter the realm of persuasive discourse but encourages teachers to expect the regression. When she asked students to respond to a selection using a moral dilemma, Miller found students produce responses that are very similar to one another. She says "we can reasonably infer that students are unable to invent and write persuasively from a highly relativistic rhetorical stance (124)." The content of these papers convinced her that the movement from ego-centric, to explanatory to persuasive discourse is indeed a movement from the writerts assumption of a union with an audience to the writer's recognition of another as an audience and finally to the writer's analysis of a distant, unfamiliar, universalized series of values in an audience (124).

In addition to the students' shifting back and forth through writing stages, our students also enter this world of issues with sheltered backgrounds, having been surrounded by peer, family and community members who share similar value systems. Former social systems have a strong

influence on values (Kegan 57). Students at first have difficulty imagining another audience because they are bound to their family-centered experience and consequent values.

In a recent College English article (157), Greg Myers discusses the possibilities for social change offered by our educational systems. He uses Huck Finn as an example of the dilemma facing students as their acquired social systems clash with new community values. Huck can only think about blacks and whites in the terms he has learned. Although he avows hatred for abolitionists, he is capable of acts of resistance to the system. But whenever Huck tries to approach the consensus view, to do what he believes is right, he thinks of returning his friend Jim to slavery. When he faces reality, he admits to himself that he is guilty in helping Jim escape.

Lawrence Kohlberg's study of developmental moral reasoning offers a context from which we can understand student progression from former value systems to newly acquired community systems. Kohlberg found that moral development proceeds through preconventional, conventional, and post conventional levels (Kohlberg 18). At the freshman level, we seem to be dealing with the transition of students from the conventional level, where maintaining the expectations of family, group or nation is valued in its own right and conformity to what the majority think is essential, to the conventional stage, a stage where "right" is defined by principles of justice, of the reciprocity and equality of human rights, and of respect for human beings as individuals" (19). Kohlberg distinguishes the goals of his model from a similar model. This model, "value clarification," advocates that children learn to be more aware of how their values relate to decisions they make, of how to make their values consistent, of the divergencies between their values and those of others, and of how to tolerate these divergencies (10). Kohlberg goes beyond these goals in

favor of a view that exposure to others more mature than ourselves helps stimulate maturity in our own value process (14).

The collaborative component of our course is particularly useful in penetrating value systems that must eventually be questioned.In our textbook, Elements of Argument, Annette Rottenberg warns students about the subversive nature of cliches of thought (48). By collaborating with others in the class, students are exposed to multiple values. Modeled from Ken Bruffee's collaborative class, the groups offer students a new sense of community where they find family maxims challenged and manipulated. In "Collaborative Learning and the Conversation of Mankind," Bruffee acknowledges the divergent backgrounds of students in an academic setting but emphasizes the opportunities for a new version of knowledge for this new community of peers (644).

In the handout package, notice Renee's paper titled "Homosexuals Should Not Gain Equal Rights." Renee's dependence on the value systems of her family or peer community becomes apparent in her approach to the issue of homosexual rights. To support her claim, Renee offers specific instances of what she considers authoritative evidence: historical, Biblical and natural law. From these instances of authority, she leaps to a conclusion that homosexuals should have no rights. What we find in Renee's response is an inherent assuredness that her audience will applaud her approach, her purpose being to buttress the opinions of her imagined audience of agreeing members of her former community.

Another useful developmental model is that of William Perry. In Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme, Perry describes nine developmental positions that lodge within the broader categories of dualism, multiplicity, relativism and commitment within relativism. Renee's progression through the course assignments suggests a parallel progression through Perry's stages. She enters, as do most

freshmen writers, with the dualistic view that issues are either right or wrong. Authority figures (parents, teachers, and clergy) determine knowledge. Dualistic students cannot acknowledge the existence of more than one point of view and take on the maxims of these authorities. In her first paper, Renee cites the historical, natural and biblical law as her authority and ends her paper with words that reflect her absolutist attitude: "I dontt care what anybody says." Further, Renee uses the words "It just makes me want to puke," illustrating not only her dependence on the value systems of former peer communities but also their language. She interprets the notion that everyone has latent homosexual tendencies as something gay people say to defend their preference and casts herself on the "good" side with the words, "I don't know about everyone, but I know I'm completely straight."

Through group activities such as presentations, debates, and peer exchange, our W132 students confront a multiplicity of views issuing from their peers. The sequence of the course assignments also provides a means for student exposure to pluralism. In the refutation assignment, students choose another student paper from the class and write a refutation of that paper. When I passed out the papers to choose from, two students were anxious to refute Reneets paper because they considered the paper an "easy hit." After these students took Renee's paper and did refutations, Renee became aware that not everyone in this community of college peers held her view that homosexuals were immoral, unlawful, and possessed no rights. Both students refuting her paper question the value of using the Bible or tradition as authoritative sources. One of the refutation papers, "Gay Rights - An Abomination?" by Teresa is included in the handout packet. After Teresa points out weaknesses in the reasoning in Reneets paper, she questions the authoritative use of historical, biblical, and natural law and ends with the statement, "The laws she cites are selective, and the

examples she uses are extremely Puritan."

When Renee read these reactions, she found that she was "out of line" with this community of college peers, and that to continue to write about the topic of homosexuals, she would have to find a way to include an acknowledgement of the view of this new community into her presentation. The course itself has thus offered an experience that exposes the diversity of opinion necessary for students to proceed to Kohlberg's post-conventional or Perry's multiplistic stage.

In our W132 course, an important shift occurs when we move from the refutation assignment to the Rogerian and Toulmin assignments. In having students analyze language and fallacies in the third assignment and then prepare a refutation in the fourth assignment, we have made them warriors of sorts. For the recipient of the refutation, the idea of an adversarial audience becomes real. For the writer of the refutation, the implication may be that becoming an adversary is always necessary to persuade an opponent. At this point in the course, some students retreat from possible clashes with opponents. Recently, when I asked a student why he dropped out at this point in the course, he responded, "Once I discovered all the potential pitfalls, I could not write without worrying about how easily someone could refute my ideas." Included in Perry's scheme of developmment are the alternatives to growth: temporizing, escape, and retreat (Perry 177-200). The attitude of the student who dropped the course matches Perry's student who says, "I tell myself that there is no way to, ah, really prove anything anyway--logic is meaningless" (183).

As our course turns from the adversarial nature of refutation to the emphathetic quality of Rogerian and Toulmin models, however, students use an approach that requires, in Kohlberg's terms, post-conventional thinking, where moral values are defined outside of the individual's association with the authority and by stepping into the shoes of others.

The shift to Rogers and Toulmin offers, in Perry terms, a chance for students to move from Position 2, Multiplicity Pre-Legitimate, where an individual prepares to move from groping in a world of uncertainty, to Level 4 , Multiplicity Correlate, where the student is able to tolerate the ambiguity of a pluralistic world.

The Rogerian approach to argument requires a presentation of an argument, an objective presentation of the arguments of an opponent, an acknowledgement of common ground, and a compromise that will injure neither party. Although Renee decided not to choose the topic of homosexuals for her Rogerian paper, one that is meant to force writers "into the shoes" of their opponents, her last paper does show evidence that she can present the views of an opponent objectively.

In this last paper, Renee abandons her first claim that homosexuals should have no rights and offers the claim that laws should make no mention of special groups, including homosexuals. This claim contradicts Renee's earlier classroom presentation where she claimed that blacks, since they have been left behind in "the race," need to be given a head start. When referring to her own group, the warrant "Any particular group that has been held back simply because they are a member of a group should be paid back with opportunities" is a maxim. Renee is unable to apply the same maxim, however, to another group because the influence of family, peer, or other received systems keeps her from doing so. Thus, she relies on a claim that avoids making a claim: "No laws should exist concerning homosexuals." Consider, however, the progress Renee has made from her original paper, "Homosexuals should not have rights."

This final paper requires that students use the methods of Stanley Toulmin to plan an argument. One of Toulmin's requirements is that writers become aware of how "argument fields" can affect the nature of an argument in terms of its claims, evidence, and warrants. For example, the

field of medicine might be concerned with homosexuality only in terms of finding a prevention for AIDS, a disease commonly associated with homosexuality, whereas the legal profession would address the rights of homosexuals. The claims, supports, warrants, and reservations will change as a new argument field is explored. The idea is to plan an argumentative presentation with an awareness of argument fields so that the supports and warrants can be checked for appropriateness against the claims. The end products of such planning need not make the overt references to argument fields that Renee does; nevertheless, by looking at the way she refers to the fields, we can observe the how the Toulmin model has an effect on Renee's ethical and moral growth.

By stepping into and out of the fields, Renee finds a refuge where she need not deny those values so deeply entrenched by her past "community." Unlike Huck Finn, who must suffer "sinfulness" when he becomes a part of Jim's escape, Renee finds a way to write about her issue and still remove herself from those views. She can say, "Here is the what the gay community has to say." "The psychologists maintain." Her part in the argument is "presenter" of other argument fields, and she is abstained from the guilt that might issue from abandoning the "received systems" of her former community. In her first paper, Renee was part of the group who used historical, biblical and natural law to condemn homosexuality, but in this paper, she shifts her reference to third person and speaks of a "society" from which she seems removed, and she refers to this group's actions as "oppressive." She writes, "Another argument field is the social effort to condemn the homosexual. Society used sodomy laws, Biblical laws, and the Law of Nature to keep the homosexual from obtaining special rights." She finishes that section with "The wonder is that more gay people did not succumb."

Thus Renee's presentation of the argument fields documents her

development where she is aware of multiplicity of opinion. Her own words in the paper demonstrate the uncertainty that accompanies this level:

> So there are two sides to every story. Which side is the right side? Who has the authority to decide? Maybe both sides are right. Considering the positive and negative sides of this group, there shouldn't be any laws for or against homosexuals.

Renee has not yet totally rejected her old value systems; in fact she has probably not come even close to rejection. She "poses" as (in Perry's terms) a multiplist, one who realizes that there are in fact multiple viewpoints about the issue but is unable to evaluate those viewpoints. But the values of her community of 18 years have a strong hold on her, and occassional references slip back. For example, at the beginning, she says, "Everyone, in some stage of their live, acts on some form of deviant behavior of such a group. The homosexual shouldn't be the only group penalized for acting upon their desires in private." Her use of the term "deviant behavior" to explain homosexuality is surely a slip from her past viewpoints.

This tendency to "pose" as an accepting person is explained by Ken Bruffee in his introduction to A Short Course in Writing where he describes how we must first pretend to be a member of that community:

> Conversations with members of another community is always somewhat mannered and strained, something of a performance. (4)

When Perry uses the term "prelegitimate," he seems to imply the same notion as Bruffee, that students do not simply pop into the next stage; their assimilation, rather, is gradual. Renee did not, during one semester, progress to a sense of committment within relativism. Nevertheless, our course in argumentation, with its concentration on

issues, offers a means for students to work toward what Kinneavy finds most lacking since rhetoric became separated from the humanities, and that quality is a sense of committment. Our course offers a path that nurtures student development towards that sense of committment.

Works Cited

Bradford, Annette. "Cognitive Immaturity and Remedial College Writers." In The Writer's Mind: Writing as a Mode of Thinking. Eds. Janice N. Hays, Phyllis A. Roth, Jon R. Ramsey, and Robert D. Foulke. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1983, 15-24.

Britton, James, Tony Burgess, Nancy Martin, Alex McLeod, and Harold Rosen. The Development of Writing Abilities (11-18). London: MacMillan Education, 1975.

Bruffee, Ken. A Short Course in Writing. 3rd ed. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1985.

_____. "Collaborative Learning and the 'Conversation of Mankind.'" College English 46 (1984): 635-52.

Kegan, Robert. The Evolving Self. Cambridge: Harvard University Press,1982.

Kinneavy, James. "Restoring the Humanities: The Return of Rhetoric from Exile." The Rhetorical Tradition and Modern Writing. Ed. James J. Murphy. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1982, 19-30.

Kohlberg, Lawrence. Essays on Moral Development. Volume 1. The Philosophy of Moral Development: Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice. Cambridge: Harper and Row, 1981.

Miller, Susan. "Rhetorical Maturity: Definition and Development. Reinventing the Rhetorical Tradition. Eds. Aviva Freedman and Ian Pringle. Ottawa, Ontario: The Canadian Council of Teachers of English, 1980, 119-128.

Myers, Greg. "Reality, Consensus, and Reform in the Rhetoric of Composition Teaching." College English 48 (1986): 154-175.

Perry, William. Forms of Intellectual and Ethical Development in the College Years: A Scheme. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Rottenberg, Annette, Elements of Argument. New York: St. Martins, 1985.

Root, Robert L, Jr. "Style and Self: The Emergence of Voice." Journal of Teaching Writing 4 (1985): 77-86.

Schultz, Anne. "Swords of Ploughshares? A Rhetorical Choice." Journal of Teaching Writing 3 (1984): 145-155.

HOMOSEXUALS SHOULD NOT GAIN EQUAL RIGHTS
By Renee

If there is a man who lies with a male
as those who lie with a woman
both of them have committed a detestable act;
They shall surely be put to death. (Leviticus 20:13)

Moses spoke these words to the children of Israel, in the book of Leviticus, that they would know what a great sin this is and not to commit it or surely be put to death. This phrase still applies today, but people refuse to take heed at the words.

The nineteenth-century has opened a new appeal to be entered into the United States Constitution as law, if it is passed. Should homosexual men and women have equal rights with the moral men and women of our society? I hope n t. The men and women with the grotesque preference of having sex with someone of the same sex cannot be compared with the "normal majority" who condemn this kind of behavior. The historical laws, the Biblical laws, and The Laws of Nature all tell their own story on homosexuals.

Homosexuality, in the thirteenth-century, was considered such an evil and disgrace that laws were made to outlaw this behavior. Some of these are:

> Anyone can accuse a man of having committed a crime against nature before the judge. If it is proven, both of those involved should be put to death. However, if one was forced or is under the age of fourteen, he should not suffer this penalty, because those who are forced are not quilty, and minors do not understand how serious a crime they have committed. (Boswell 289)

At almost the same time in France, the legal school of Orle'ans issued a code requiring for the first offense by a male castration; for the second, dismemberment; for the third, burning. This provision, specifically mentions female homosexuality as well, stipulating dismemberment for the first two offenses by a woman and burning for the third (290).

Even though it is doubtful that any provisions of this sort were regularly enforced, but it has something to say about what is wrong with the act itself. If there was nothing wrong with it, they wouldn't have gone through so much trouble to make laws against it.

Until 1962, sexual behavior between persons of the same sex was criminal in all 50 states. Today in 29 states the sexual behavior of homosexual persons is criminal. There are a variety of laws ranging from the prohibition of sodomy to the prohibition of "gross indecencies between two men and two women. These crimes are often felonies, carrying penalties of up to 20 years in prison. Arguments to support such laws have been:

1. Based on the longevity of the statute--the "it's always been like that" argument.
2. Religious in nature.
3. Since the state has the right to punish criminal behavior, it

has the right to make homosexual behavior criminal
(Paul, Weinrich, Gonsiorek, and Hotvedt 75)

In 1976, the U.S. Supreme Court summarily upheld the decision of Doe v. Commonwealth's Attorney for Richmond. In Doe, two gay men challenged the Constitutionality of the sodomy statute of Virginia. A three judge federal panel upheld the statute by a vote of two to one.

The decision was upheld without comment by the U.S. Supreme Court. The effect has been to legitimize the current criminal sanctions against homosexual behavior (81).

From the time of Biblical prohibition right down to the present day, homosexual behavior has been considered horrible. For centuries it was referred to as "that bominable sin not fit to be named among Christians" (Hoffman 100).

In the Bible, homosexuality is stated as a detestable act, an abomination, and cities have been destroyed because its sin is so great. God tells how man abandoned the natural function of the woman.

The Bible directly says, "You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination" (Leviticus 18:22).

The story of Somom and Gomorrah is told, "The men of the city, the Men of Sodom, surrounded the house, both young and old, all the people from every quarter; and they called to Lot and said to him, "where are the men who came to you tonight? Bring them out to us that we may have relations with them" (Genesis 19:4,5).

All the men of Sodom and Gomorrah tried to engage in sexual intercourse with the angels sent from God to destroy them. "We are about to destroy this place, because their outcry has become so great before the Lord" (Genesis 19:13) "Then the Lord rained on Somom and Gomorrah brimstone and fire" (Genesis 19:24).

The true story of Sodom and Gomorrah has long been used as proof of the homosexual sin that neither God nor the majority of our population agree with. When God created the earth, he made Adam's mate a woman, not another man.

The Bible tells how men have abandoned the natural function of the woman and have burned in their desire towards one another, men with men committing indecent acts. They "left the natural use of the woman." They had [legitimate] enjoyment and abandoned it, going after a different one, they persued the unnatural (Boswell 109).

Gay people began to defend their preference and criticize their opponents. They like to point out that "everyone is queer"--"either latent (lying hidden in a person) or bilatant" (Altman 67). I don't know about everyone, but I know I'm completely straight. They also say things like:

There is no desire for women in my soul, but the glow of males has set me on fire (Boswell 124).

True love has nothing to do with women's quarters,

nor will I agree that you have ever felt love for
women, any more than flies feel love for milk. (125)

But if this [heterosexual] passion must also be called
"love," it is an effeminate and illegitimate one...it deserves to be
banished (126).

I guess, if we let them have their way, every race on the face of the earth would die out. All of this nonsense is making me want to puke. A collection of versus in favor of gay love goes like this:

A woman's love is not love but poison
It taste like honey, but it is deceptive:
it is pus, full of rot.
If anyone should ask, Why do we honor them?
We honor women because offspring issue from them,
and they are the watchdogs of the home
like wolves of their dens (264).

Whoever had the nerve to write that a woman's love is only poison, is sick. In my opinion, gay love is the only poison in question. Following these few lines is written: "Let them perish and go to hell, never to return,/who prefer young men as wives" (264).

The Law of Nature implies that all men have certain inherent active tendencies toward life, which is the natural way to live. There is a certain degree of freedom in a man's nature so that he can choose good (i.e., the natural) over the bad (i.e., unnatural). When a man keeps choosing the natural behavior, he develops into a mature member of his species (Hoffman 105). This does not imply that he/she becomes a mature member of the opposite sex.

Anatomy has forced the homosexual to explore the realities of polymorphous (The occurence of different forms or stages in individuals of the same species) eroticism beyond the experiences of most heterosexuals, because they are denied the "natural" naval-to-naval coupling of men/women (Altman 66).

It would seem to me, that since having sexual intercourse is so obviously difficult, such explorations would not be practiced further.

Because homosexuality cannot find justification in either religion or marriage, it represents sex as something that is love free of any social ends, and this fact may help explain the horror with which homosexuality is regarded. (Altman 66)

A man, I think, would be insulted if he were to ask a beautiful woman to dance and her voice was deeper than his, implying that she was actually a he. What if the homosexual or transvestite had gotten the man back to his apartment under this disguise and ended up raping him or forcing sexual intentions on him? I don't think homosexuals should have the right to dress as women or impersonate them unless it is apparent that they are actually men.

I compare homosexuality to heterosexuality as, lovemaking in an automobile and in a meadow. It is not natural. In my eyes, homosexuals are not equal to the human beings who abide by the historical laws, Biblical laws, and the Law of Nature in performing the act of making love with the opposite sex. To me, the act of making love has not been accomplished between partners of the same sex. All of these laws and views seem to sum up the same conclusion: Homosexuals should not have equal rights! I don't care what anybody says.

WORKS CITED

The Bible. Revised Standard Version.

Altman, Davis. Homosexual: Opression and Liberation. New York: Outerbridge & Dienstfrey, 1971.

Paul, Weinrich, Gonsiorek, & Hotvedt. "Homosexuality and the Law." In Homosexuality. Ed. William Paul. Beverly Hills: Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, 1981-1982.

Hoffman, Martin. The Gay World: Male Homosexuality and the Social Creation of Evil. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Boswell, John. Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality. Chicago: Univeristy of Chicago Press, 1984.

Gay Rights - an Abomination?
By Teresa

A paper written by Renee is titled "Homosexuals Should Not Gain Equal Rights." Renee makes a claim of value, using no substantial support to back her claim. The evidence she uses as proof that homosexuals should not have equal rights is neither sufficient nor convincing.

According to Renee, homosexuality is neither normal, nor natural. Homosexuals are not equal to the "normal majority." As evidence of this, whe uses historical, biblical, and natural law. The beginning of her paper starts out:

> If there is a man who lies with a male as those who lie with a woman, both of them have committed a detestable act; they shall surely be put to death (Leviticus 20:13). Moses spoke these words to the children of Israel, in the book of Leviticus, that they would know what a great sin this is and not to commit it or surely be put to death. This phrase still applies today, but people refuse to take heed at the words.*

*All quotations include quthor's orginal grammar and punctuation.

This statement implies that not only is homosexuality a sin, but is still punishable by death. Renee relies heavily on the Bible to prove her point that homosexuality is wrong, therefore homosexuals should not have equal rights. The problems with using the Bible is that not everyone has Judeo-Christian beliefs, and religion cannot be used as a legitimate source to prove an argument against legislation. This is the weakest link in Renees' argument.

As further proof that homosexuality has no place in society, Renee cites historical laws:

> At almost the same time in France, the legal school of Orle'ans issued a code requiring for the first offense by a male castration; for the second, dismemberment; for the third, burning (Boswell 290).
>
> Even though it is doubtful that any provisions of this sort were regularly enforced, but it has something to say about what is wrong with the act itself. If there was nothing wrong with it, they wouldn't have gone through so much trouble to make laws against it.

This is a barbaric Thirteenth Century law with little significance in the Twentieth Century. She cites another law:

> There are a variety of laws ranging from the prohibition of sodomy to the prohibition of "gross indecencies" between two men and two women. These crimes are often felonies, carrying penalties of up to 20 years in prison. Arguments to support such laws have been:

1. Based on the longevity of the statute--the "it's always been like that" argument.

2. Religious in nature.

3. Since the state has the right to punish criminal behavior it has the right to make homosexual behavior criminal (Paul, Weinrich, Gonsiorek, and Hotvedt 75).

The three points used to justify the law is not proof of the law's validity. Also, the law is from 1962. In recent years, the laws against homosexuality have changed. "In 1975 the state legislature in Maine decriminalized homosexual intercourse, among both females and males, as a part of a major revision of the state criminal code" (Coh, Gallagher 72). Renees' use of out of date laws are another weak link in her argument. She then cites the laws of Nature:

> The Law of Nature implies that all men have certain inherent active tendencies toward life, which is the natural way to live. There is a certain degree of freedom in a man's nature so that he can choose good (i.e. the natural) over the bad (i.e. unnatural). When a man keeps choosing the natural behavior, he develops into a mature member of his species (Hoffman 105).

Renee responds, "This does not imply that he/she becomes a member of the opposite sex". Her reply seems irrelevant to the passage she cites. The reference to natural law may be misleading. "The laws of Nature are man made and have been modified (also by man) from time to time to make them conform to the facts of Nature as and when new facts are discovered" (Huxley 12). "Whatever rights and responsibilities the rulers and citizens have in a state are derived from some agreement; no social right is derived from nature" (Rousseau). Therefore, natural law is man made, not something inherent. Man decides what is to be considered good (natural) or bad (unnatural).

At the beginning in her paper, Renee writes, "The men and women with the grotesque preference of having sex with someone of the same sex cannot be compared with the normal majority". Later in the paper she writes, "In my eyes, homosexuals are not equal to the human beings who abide by the historical laws, biblical laws, and the laws of nature in performing the act of making love with the opposite sex". She first says that they are not comparable, but then compares them by saying that they are not equal. Renee makes use of an analogy; "I compare homosexuality to heterosexuality as, lovemaking in an automobile and in a meadow. It is not natural. That analogy does not follow. While love making in a car might be illegal in most areas, many heterosexual teenagers (and their parents - who used to be teenagers) would disagree that it is "unnatural."

Renees' thesis statement is, "Should homosexual men and women have equal rights with the moral men and women of our society? I hope not". To prove that they should not, she cites biblical laws, historical laws, and laws of nature, to lead to a conclusion of why they should not have equal rights. She does not describe the rights in question except to say;

> A man, I think, would be insulted if he were to ask a beautiful woman to dance and her voice was deeper than his, implying that she was actually a he. What if the homosexual or transvestite had gotten the man back to his apartment under this disguise and ended up raping him or forcing sexual intentions on him? I don't think homosexuals should have the right to dress as women or impersonate them unless it is apparent (sic) that they are actually men.

Is Renee saying that all women with deep voices are really men or men with high voices female? Rape is illegal regardless of the sexes of the persons involved. Transvestites are not necessarily homosexuals - they are merely persons who enjoy wearing clothing of the opposite sex. Renee does not address the issue of women who appear to be men.

The language Renee uses is very emotional. The idea of homosexuality is clearly distasteful to her. "I guess, if we let them have their way, every race on the face of the earth would die out. All of this nonsense is making me want to puke" In response to a pro-homosexual poem, she writes, "Whoever had the nerve to write that a woman's love is only poison, is sick. In my opinion, gay love is the only poison in question". She also makes her own sexual preference known; "I don't know about everyone, but I know I'm completely straight". Renees' personal biases and opinions arenot valid arguments against the issue of gay rights.

The examples and sources Renee uses throughout her paper do not lead logically to the conclusion that homosexuals should not gain equal rights. The laws she cites are selective, and the examples she uses are extremely Puritan. Renee makes no attempt to hide her prejudice toward homosexuals. The absence of objective facts and information turn an argument against gay rights into a personal "soapbox." Actually, Renee leaves no room for argument. Her final statements, "All of these laws and views seem to sum up the same conclusion: Homosexuals should not have equal rights! I don't care what anybody says", close any discussion of the issue.

Works Cited

The Bible. Revised Standard Version. In Waller, Renee. "Homosexuals Should Not Gain Equal Rights" (unpublished paper).

Cohn, Steven F. and Gallagher. "Gay Movements and Legal Change: Some Aspects of the Dynamics of a Social Problem."

Hoffman, Martin. The Gay World: Male Homosexuality and the Social Creation of Evil. New York: Basic Books, 1975. In Waller, Renee. "Homosexuals Should Not Gain Equal Rights" (unpublished paper).

Huxley, Julian. Essays of a Biologist. Detroit: Gale Research Company, 1923.

Paul, Weinrich, Gonsiorek, and Hotvedt. "Homosexuality and the Law." In Waller, Renee. "Homosexuals Should Not Gain Equal Rights" (unpublished paper).

Rousseau, Jean Jacques. "The Social Contract." In Masterpieces of World Philosophy in summary form. New York, 1970.

THE LAW SHOULD BE SILENT ABOUT
THE HOMOSEXUAL ISSUE
By Renee

American homosexuals have been isolated both as individuals and as a group. In the past, they were quiet about their sexual preference and did not demand equal rights as homosexuals. Now the times have changed; homosexuals have come together to speak against society's prejudice that has been placed upon them by Americans.

Until the twentieth century, Americans tended to refrain from public discussion of sex. Americans were little prepared for the parade of sex reformers who appeared in search of public support (Pivar 1). The nation has never been so confused in the subject of homosexuality as now (Rottenburg 376). So they used sodomy laws, Biblical laws, and the Law of Nature to brand homosexuality immoral and keep them from obtaining special rights.

An individual who feels he is different or whom others say is different, or who is told that he is a homosexual, often begins to conform to the expected behavior of such a group. When there are sufficient numbers of individuals whose behavior is stigmatized, there is a tendency to band together and then the behavior is enhanced and made more visible. Sometimes, however, individuals so labeled consciously turn away from the behavior pattern because they are unhappy with such an identity (Bullough and Bullough 199-200).

Everyone, in some stage of their live, acts on some form of deviant behavior that has been hidden. The homosexual shouldn't be the only group penalized for acting upon their desires in private. The act is merely a matter of preference

My side of this argument starts by stating the homosexual issue objectively. Homosexual meetings are not what people would expect. They are more likely to begin with a barbecue, a dinner/dance or a visit to the theater, with little to distinguish the group from any other, except perhaps the particular self-mocking in-jokes that typify any minority group or, possibly, the clothes that they wear (Gosselin and Wilson 27).

The homosexual community are people just like you and I--they are nothing to praise and nothing to condemn. It is important not to lose sight of the fact that a homosexual is after all a human being, and a citizen of the U.S. despite the fact that he/she finds there sexual gratification with a person of the same persuasion (Paul, Weinrich, Gonsiorek, & Hotvedt 303).

Homosexuals may be different from the majority in private but in public they are not any different from any other group. No group should be penalized for being different. The law should be silent about these people because sexual preference is a private matter of consenting adults.

Homosexuality is a form of inherent behavior influenced by glandular secretions that shouldn't be either praised or condemned. Psychologist, Magnus Hirschfeld, who was convinced that homosexuality was not a deviation, but was the result of certain inborn characteristics influenced by glandular secretions (Bullough and Bullough 208). In most children, sexual orientation--the "learned" behavior is fixed early in life, probably by age five (Rottenburg 379).

My claim is: There shouldn't be any laws for or against homosexuals.

My support for this claim is: Sexual preference is a private matter of consenting adults.

My warrant is: There shouldn't be any laws regarding the sexual preference of consenting adults. The support for this warrant is: The Federal Government cannot enforce one religion, all religions or prefer one religion over another because religious preference is a private matter of each individual person (Prichett 94). Since homosexuality is also a private matter of individual persons, there also shouldn't be any laws for or against homosexuals.

The examination of a related argument field pertains to gays wanting special rights. To gays, liberation means the demand for equal protection under the law. It also means the right to decide who one is both creatively and socially and to live as the person that one is. The special rights they are persuing are:

1.) Recognition of homosexuality not as an abnormality or an aberration, as has been shown by anthropological studies.
2.) The dismantling or restructuring or discriminatory social institutions (Woodman and Lenna 8).
3.) Protective laws like those passed in favor of colored people and women.

Homosexuals are in a category by themselves and the majority of people don't know how to cope with a group that utilizes their "right to be different." So the majority's solution to this problem is to ignore this minority group. The homosexuals keep knocking on the door, but no one will answer it.

Another argument field are the social efforts to condemn the homosexual. Society used sodomy laws, Biblical laws, and the Law of Nature to keep the homosexual from obtaining special rights. Homosexuality, in the thirteenth century, was considered such an evil and disgrace that laws were made to outlaw this behavior. One provision is:

> Anyone can accuse a man of having committed a crime against nature before the judge. If it is proven, both of those involved should be put to death. However, if one was forced or is under the age of fourteen, he should not suffer this penalty, because those who are forced are not guilty, and minors do not understand how serious a crime they have committed (Boswell 289).

Today in 29 states the sexual behavior of homosexual persons is criminal. There are a variety of laws ranging from the prohibition of sodomy to the prohibition of "gross indecencies" between two men and two women (Paul, Weinrich, Gonsiorek, & Hotvedt 75).

Having established an ideal government, Puritans strove to maintain reformation ideals of sexual morality. The church became the major institution of moral control, administering laws upon delinquent religionists (Pivar 19).

The Bible tells how men have abandoned the natural function of the woman and have burned in their desire towards one another, men with men committing indecent acts. They "left the natural use of the woman." They had [legitimate] enjoyment and abandoned it, going after a different one, they persued the unnatural (Boswell 109). The Bible also states explicitly, "You shall not lie with a male as one lies with a female; it is an abomination" (Leviticus 18:22).

The tendency, in sexual matters was to promote hypocrisy and to force sexual deviancy "underground." Ascetics (people who practice strict self-denial as a religious discipline) who administered justice with cold dispassion, according to natural and divine law, felt the threats of both real and imagined sexual incontinence (lacking in self-restraint or sensuous desires) (Pivar 19).

The Law of Nature implies that all men have certain inherent active tendencies toward life, which is the natural way to live. There is a certain degree of freedom in a man's nature so that he can choose good (i.e., the natural) over the bad (i.e., unnatural). When a man keeps choosing the natural
behavior, he develops into a mature member of his species (Hoffman 105).

Because homosexuality cannot find justification in either religion or marriage, it represents sex as something that is love free of any social ends, and this fact may help explain the horror with which homosexuality is regarded (Altman 66).

The last argument field I will discuss is the public discussion of lesbian literature in public schools and the effects of homosexual teachers upon our youth Lesbians are trying to start a class of lesbian literature at MMLA and introduce lesbian content into high-school curricula in Minneapolis (hart 14). that's exposure to our children that may be beyond our wishes.

Toni Mcnaron first acted on her feelings for women while in her initial months as a new teacher at an Episcopal girls' school in Vicksburg, Miss. (harvey and Gochros 21). Ms. McNaron says she first acted on her feelings for women. Did she act on them with any of her female students? did teaching in an all girls school prompt her lesbian tendencies? Would you want your children taught by a homosexual?

On the other hand, the students may find themselves more attracted to the gay teacher than to the usual male authority figure, since the gay teachers' energy and involvement in their mutually stimulating material is quite different. The teacher becomes a model not simply of authority, but of freedom, risk-taking (if he or she is open about her orientation), and (to some) radically new ideas (Masters 28). So there <u>are</u> two sides to every story. Which side is the right side? Who has the authority to decide? Maybe both sides are right. Considering the positive and the negative side of this particular group, there shouldn't be any laws for or against homosexuals.

Presentation of the gay point of view begins with the oppression that society has placed upon them. Until the 1970s gay had to invest considerable emotional energy in coping and existing with a hostile, destructive social environment. Having their lifestyles branded as immoral, criminal, or sick, they constantly had to be on guard lest they be discovered and their

reputations be destroyed and their freedom lost. Any effort to express their experience in their own terms was rejected or ignored (Bullough and Bullough 7).

To the degree that homosexuals are convinced of and act on the myths and negative views held by society, the beliefs are largely fulfilled. If society for any reason is discomforted by a group of people, it immediately isolates the members and brands them with a stigmatizing label. After this is done, the society can impose social and legal sanctions. When members of the oppressed minority act out the sterotypes that presumably apply to them, the oppressors cite the behavior as justification for further oppression. When some of the victims find no recourse but suicide, it is seen as further proof of mental instability.

The wonder is that more gay people did not succumb to the destructive attitudes of the dominant society before the 1970s. Despite the harsh oppression and the safety in remaining an invisible minority, there was open resistance. The formation of gay organizations seems of particular significance. By the 1950s and 1960s, homosexuals were banding together for mutual support and for countering oppressive conditions. Social efforts to isolate the homosexual began to crumble (8).

"Should we gays take responsibility' for our oppression?" (White 35). The author of States of Desire: Travels in Gay America, Edmund White, states in his book, "I'm trying to help gays free themselves of the damage done by the four religions most oppressive to us: jews, Catholics, Fundamentalists, and Mormons. There is so much gay self-hatred" (39).

A. Their claim is: It is time for gays to bring their concerns out of the closet and have laws protecting their particular group.
B. The support for their claim is: Gays are feeling oppression about their secrecy.
C. Their warrant is: Any group feeling oppressed should have special laws protecting that group.

The support for their claim is that, gays are feeling oppression about their secrecy, puberty, being a gay parent, and getting older. In most cases, identity as a gay must eventually be confronted. Choices must be made and questions asked. "Should I conceal my sexuality? Should I go into or remain in the closet? (Woodman and Lenna 20). They are caught between silence on one side and fear on the other, the typical closeted gay academic spends his or her professional life in a state of constant duplicity, internally and externally divided by a lie that is not spoken, by an act of deception that is never acted out (Cruikshank 5). For many, hiding their homosexuality appears to be the most socially realistic choice. For others, the decision may be to acknowledge their sexuality and find some social meanings in which they can interact as gay persons. Some gays can adjust to concealing their sexuality, but they pay heavy social and psychological costs. The possibility of discovery and the fear of its consequences are always present. Also, there is a constant need to lie and to pretend to be heterosexual. The stress of these consequences requires continuously being on guard (Woodman and Lenna 20).

With the onset of puberty, the issue of identity becomes critical for the gay youth. Feelings about being different become erotocized labels such as "queer," "fag," "homo," "fairy," or "dyke" become common (74).

One homosexual teenager had had sex with a girl at one point in his life. He said, "When I like a girl I feel as if I have no right, as if I didn't have permission. Then I feel as if I am no good in some way...like I have to be recognized by some man" (Bieber 210).

Another homosexual boy confessed to his psychiatrist after he had begun to trust him, "I would prefer not to be a homosexual but I can't help myself. I want to be a father just like every other father, but I'm half boy and half girl" (209).

Important questions arise from the gay parent: "When, what, and how do I tell the children about my gay identity?" Other issues are how to include a gay partner in the family unit; how to deal with the reactions of the non-gay parent, neighbors, school personnel, and other gays and other gay families (115).

Older men who are coming out for the first time need all the supports that a younger man needs. for these men, for example, it is as hard to tell children and grandchildren that they consider themselves homosexuals as it is for younger men to tell their parents (Berger 27).

The antihomosexual people think the most important factor in social existence is the foundation of a home, and to the awakening of altruistic feeling, first for a person of the opposite sex, then for the offspring (Bullough and Bullough 206). They say it is impossible to be both a self-accepting homosexual and live a conventional life in American Society (Altman 38).

Antihomosexuals convey a general sense of homosexuality as an alien, threatening influence with unpredictable consequences, yet which is known to be destructive to individual character, morality, stability, and vital social institutions including the family and religion. Homosexuality--"it"--is viewed as a threat that is so general, and so similar to other conditions such as drug abuse or prostitution, that "it" becomes a moral metaphor for evil of many kinds. "It" amounts to a translation of sin in the terms of social policy (Paul, Weinrich, Gonsiorek, & Hotvedt 41). The antihomosexual group denies "the right to be different."

Some people are for gay rights, some are against them, and the rest don't care either way. The only medium and decision that makes neither side the winner is that, there shouldn't be any laws for or against homosexuals.

In refuting the gay point of view, I will first refute their support then their warrant. Gays are feeling oppression about their secrecy. If gays thought they were feeling oppression when homosexuality was a secret, they should be feeling alot worse now that they have brought more attention to themselves and people are acting negatively towards them.

Their warrant, "Any group feeling oppressed should have special laws protecting that group," is too far-fetched to even consider. If every group who felt oppression got laws protecting that group, there would be a great number of groups wanting laws created for them. Then the whole situation will have gotten out of control. There would be too much emphasis within our judicial system on such a trivial matter. Also, the law does not exist for

reasons of stimulating a minority groups interest. The law exists to keep order within the society. To sum this all up, each minority group feeling oppressed, without significant reason, should not have special laws protecting that group. So there also shouldn't be any laws for or against homosexuals.

Since I have refuted the homosexual support and warrant, I will proceed to refute the antihomosexual viewpoint. The antihomosexual view is vague. Few had thought out their ideas at all. The antihomosexual labeled the homosexual as "an alien, and a threatening influence with unpredictable consequences." They do not state why the "alien" label identifies with the homosexual. If it is because he is different, then everyone is an "alien," for there are not two people on this earth who are exactly alike.

They also say, "The most important factor in social existence is the foundation of a home, and to the awakening of altruistic feeling, first for a person of the opposite sex, then for the offspring." "The most important factor in social existence" means different things to different people. To one person, their job may be the most important in their "social existence." To another person, the most important factor may be their car or home. Antihomosexuals don't have the authority to label the most important aspects of social existence, from 1-10 or whatever the case may be, of individuals lives, and homosexuals aren't the only minority group wanting special rights. There shouldn't be any laws for or against homosexuals.

The only common ground I stand on with homosexuals is their right "to be let alone." I'm sure they don't like the stigmatisms that have been placed upon them--name calling, destruction of property, beatings, and prejudice; I don't agree with them either. They should have the right to be left alone just like anyone else as stated in the constitution under "The Right to Privacy"" (Schmidhauser 336).

The common ground I stand on with antihomosexuals is the fact that homosexuals are a minority and all minority groups shouldn't have special rights protecting those groups.

My claim, there shouldn't be any laws for or against homosexuals, is justified because it is the only solution that makes neither the homosexual or the antihomosexual the winner in this great controversy.

Related argument fields are the equal rights for women and colored people. Women and colored people insist on the exact same rights the white male possess--equal opportunity, equal wages...etc., that is not the case with homosexuals, who, unlike colored people and women, are already well integrated into the economy. Homosexual men and women are fully protected in the exercise of their recognized constitutional rights as any other citizens, but they are seeking what society declares as immoral, ungodly, and unnatural (Paul, Weinrich, Gonsioredk, & Hotvedt 303).

America owes homosexuals fairness because of the way they have been treated in the past, but not the kind of equality they seek. Homosexual activists refer to gay rights laws as educational efforts (Rottenburg 381). Homosexuals seek special rights that society is not ready to grant.

Works Cited

Altman, Davis. Homosexual: Opression and Liberation. New York: Outerbridge & Dienstfrey, 1971.

Berger, Raymond M. Gay and Gray: The Older Homosexual Man. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1982.

The Bible. Revised Standard Version.

Bieber, Irving. Homosexuality: A Pychoanalytic Study. New York: Basic Books, 1962.

Boswell, John. Christianity, Social Tolerance, and Homosexuality. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Bullough, Vern L., and Bonnie Bullough. Sin, Sickness and Sanity: A History of Sexual Attitudes. New York: Garland, 1977.

Cruishank, Margaret. Lesbian Studies. New York: Basic Books, 1980.

Gooselin, Chris Ph.D., and Glenn Wilson Ph.D. Sexual Variations. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1980.

Hart, John. The Theory and Practice of Homosexuality. London; Boston: Routledge and Kegan, 1981.

Harvey, L. and Jean Gochros. The Sexually Oppressed. New York: Associated Press, 1977.

Hoffman, Martin. The Gay World: Male Homosexuality and the Social Creation of Evil. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Masters, William H. Homosexuality in Perspective. 1st. Ed. Boston: Little Brown, 1979.

Pivar, David J. Purity Crusade: Sexual Morality and Social Control. Westport Conn./London England, 1973.

Pritchett, C., Herman. The American Constitutional System. University of Chicago: McGraw-Hill Book Co, 1963.

Rottenburg, Annette T. Elements of Argument. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1985.

Schmidhauser, John, R. constitutional Law in the Political Process. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1963.

Woodman, Natalie Jane, and Lenna Harry. Counseling with Gay Men and Women. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980.

Paul, Weinrich, Gonsiorek, & Hotvedt. "Homosexuality and the Law." In Homosexuality. Ed. William Paul. Beverly Hills: society for the Psychological Studey of Social Issues, 1981-1982.